

and also a good manager. For all that I was offered thirty dollars a month. Now, I ask, what profession expects so much of those who take it up and gives so little in return? How many women do we have among us who can say that they have done twenty-five-years' active work and are not physically wrecks? I think it is about time that this question is looked into.

ROSA A. SAFFEIR,
137 East Fortieth Street.

DEAR EDITOR: Your suggestion and remarks about raising money for the Columbia course were so excellent that I am forwarding my mite in hopes it will be one of many hundreds. What a splendid thing it would be if the nurses of America were to endow this course themselves, in courageous and active self-help, instead of thinking "Mr. Millionaire ought to endow it," or "Mrs. Billionaire will perhaps give some money to it"? Our nurses are actually able to do it if they will. They are, on the whole, a well-paid set of women. And would it not be a glorious opportunity for the modern nurse to prove that she really does appreciate her advantages, and that she really does wish to pay the debt of the past and to invest in the future?

I am sure that nurses to-day would be glad to show that they too can make some sacrifice for their profession, to which our pioneers gave all that they had. And it is most important, too, to remember the warnings of the Special Course Committee, not to allow the control of the course to be taken out of the nurses' hands. Yours truly,

L. L. DOCK.

[Miss Dock's contribution was twenty-five dollars.—Ed.]

DEAR EDITOR: As the fall of the year approaches our thoughts naturally revert to the winter work. The meetings of the Manhattan and Bronx Association will commence in October. Let us hope that all members of that association will take up the work with renewed health and vigor and make vigorous efforts to attend the meetings and become interested. It has been hard, sometimes, to get a quorum. Out of a membership of seventy-five surely such ought not to be the case. Yet when speaking to members individually the fault seems to be procrastination—always putting off, waiting until the next time. The next time comes and something else happens. When one thinks that it only means eight meetings in all, and that those who have attended religiously are busy nurses, a very little effort on the part of other members might help the work along by introducing a new element, making the meetings recreational occasionally. The more people one meets, the pleasanter

the meetings; the more ideas and thoughts introduced, the less likelihood of getting into a rut. Expansion is what we need in all ways.

The nursing world just now is on the threshold of a great future, a period of evolution. The private nurses of New York have a right to take some part in this process of evolution, to have some say in matters which concern them now and may concern them more in the future. As individuals only a limited amount of good can be done, but as a body a great deal may be accomplished. Therefore let us have a few more workers, enthusiastic, helpful, and earnest. We have many promises already, and I am sure this winter's work will bear good fruit.

We certainly have much to be thankful for for the good work done by the officers of the association who attended so faithfully all last winter in spite of their own arduous work, in some cases one person doing the work of two, and not only for the doing of it, but for the manner of the doing, without any feeling of resentment, but just because of the great interest in the work. It is just such workers as that who have helped great measures, not the lackadaisical ones.

M. A. MOORE.

[LETTERS to the Editor must be accompanied by the name in full and address of the writer, otherwise such communications cannot be recognized. The name need not appear in the JOURNAL unless so desired.—ED.]



A SAFE PRESERVATIVE FOR MILK.—The *New York and Philadelphia Medical Journal* says: "*Presse médicale* states that P. Diffloth, Adolphe Renard, and Charles Nicolle have been studying the action of hydrogen dioxide on milk and have come to the conclusion that the best method for preserving that fluid is to add from one to two per cent. of the antiseptic as soon as possible after milking, and to leave the milk in a cool place from six to eight hours before it is used. The milk thus treated is tasteless and odorless, and does not differ in any way from fresh milk. When churned it coagulates in exactly the same time. Hydrogen dioxide cannot be compared to other antiseptics, the addition of which to milk is justifiably prohibited. While the latter, in order to be effective, must often be used in toxic doses and remain subsequently in the milk for an indefinite period, hydrogen dioxide disappears entirely in a short time. In contact with milk it is decomposed into nascent oxygen and water, so that at the end of a few hours no trace of it remains."